

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,185	03/20/2006	Laszlo Hars	US020605	6380
	7590 09/11/200 ELLECTUAL PROPER	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 3001		AVERY, JEREMIAH L		
BRIARCLIFF	MANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/11/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/540,185	HARS, LASZLO		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JEREMIAH AVERY	2131		

	JEREMIAH AVERY	2131					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 02 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar i, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	ED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period value of val	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of thortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	of the date of appeal. Since				
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	ter form for appeal by materially red	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (f	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	owable if submitted in a separate, t						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	planation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
	/Christopher A. Revak/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2131					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regards to the Applicant's arguments pertaining to the calam language of 'defining at least one distortion algorithm executable to generate a lower culty version of the electronic content by a distortion of a high quality version of the electronic content", the Examiner maintains the previously-cited grounds of rejection, in particular but not limited to, column 5, lines 62-1, "different quality levels of preview available to different types of users (e.g., lower level with least clear data preview for general population, higher level preview with clearer data for club members, and full playback for authorized or paid customers)" and lines 27-31 and column 4, lines 27-47, "where the encryption is more significant, there comes a degree of disruption at which the medic is rendered substantially impreceptible or of such low quality as to be substantially unsuitable to the recipient". The rendering of the data to a lower quality, as disclosed by Yu, is analogous to the Applicant's claim language, "to generate a lower version of the electronic content by a distortion of a high quality content version of the electronic content."

The claim language of "distortion" is broadly interpreted by the Examiner to be analogous to, inter alia, the "degree of disruption" as disclosed by Yu.

Further, the claim language of "a high quality version of an electronic content" is broadly interpreted by the Examiner to be analogous to the "higher level preview with clearer data for club members" as disclosed by Yu. Further, the "distortion algorithm executable to generate a lower quality version of the electronic content by a distortion of a high quality version of the electronic content is broadly interpreted by the Examiner to be, inter alia, the "lower level with least clear data preview for general population" as disclosed by Yu. Content is viewable at higher and lower qualities, depending upon the particular level of access that a user possesses.

Also, within column 7, lines 1-8 and 31-57, the "decryption keys" of Yu provide a means for the decrypting and decoding of "a high quality version of an electronic content" as claimed by the Applicant (e.g. column 7, lines 41-45, "The authorized ustomer who paid for the medium can access another enhancement layer representing the highest quality with a single (or multiple) decryption key(s) obtained at time of purchases."